

**REMARKS**

Applicants thank the Examiner for consideration given the present application. Claim 1-4 are currently pending. Claim 1 has been amended and claim 5-12 have been cancelled through this Reply. Claim 1 is independent. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejected claims in light of the amendment and remarks presented herein, and earnestly seek timely allowance of all pending claims.

**The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter**

The Office Action rejects claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Japanese Patent Publication No. 2001-241693 to Boku et al. (Boku); and rejects claims 3, 7 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Boku. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, “the adsorber is formed by adsorption heat exchangers connected to the refrigerant circuit and having the refrigerant flowing inside there through and an adsorbent carried on their surfaces.” The applied references fail to teach or suggest the recited features of independent claim 1.

Boku discloses an air conditioner that includes a compressor 21, a radiator 22, an expansion device 23 and a heat sink 24. The refrigerant is compressed into a supercritical pressure state radiating heat into the second air using a radiator 22. The refrigerant after expansion carries out an endoergic reaction with the first air using the heat sink 24. See paragraph [0008] of Boku.

The Office Action asserts that Boku discloses a system comprising adsorption heat exchangers 30 connected to the refrigerant circuit 20 using R22 as the refrigerant. However, the

adsorption means 30 of Boku are not connected to the refrigerant circuit 20, but are merely connected to the heat exchangers 22, 24 of the refrigerant circuit 20 by an air passage (i.e. duct passages 61, 62). See Fig. 5 and paragraph [0059] of Boku. The adsorption means 30 of Boku does not have any refrigerant flowing inside therethrough, and thus significantly differ from the adsorption heat exchanger of the present invention. Thus, the applied reference fails to teach or suggest the recited features of independent claim 1.

For at least the reasons stated above, independent claim 1 is patentably distinct from the applied reference. The dependent claims are at least allowable by virtue of their dependence on corresponding allowable independent claim 1.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections of the claims based on the applied reference is respectfully requested.

### **Conclusion**

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Obert H. Chu, Reg. No. 52,744 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

Application No.: 10/565,109  
Reply to Office Action of June 26, 2008

Docket No.: 4633-0157PUS1

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.147; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: September 17, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By. 

D. Richard Anderson  
Registration No.: 40,439  
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP  
8110 Gatehouse Road  
Suite 100 East  
P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000  
Attorney for Applicant